



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/577,637

04/28/2006

Denis Barritault

251867

5413

23460

7590

03/04/2010

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731

EXAMINER

WESTERBERG, NISSA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/04/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Chgpatent@leydig.com

Chgpatent1@leydig.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/577,637	Applicant(s) BARRITAU LT ET AL.	
	Examiner Nissa M. Westerberg	Art Unit 1618	

All Participants:

(1) Nissa M. Westerberg.

(2) Ken Spina.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 February 2010

Time: 1 pm ET

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner called to clarify how the species elected in the December 17, 2009 reply fits within the scope of the claims. It was determined that the elected polymer does not fit within the scope of claim 1 due to the absence of the "R" group in -R0S03R' substituent. Applicant indicated that they did not wish to change the elected species but claim 1 would be amended and electronically filed so as to encompass the elected species.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)